

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-1224

GARCIA FINANCIAL GROUP, INCORPORATED, a
District of Columbia corporation; JON J.
GARCIA, an individual and resident of the
District of Columbia,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

versus

VIRGINIA ACCELERATORS CORPORATION, a Virginia
corporation; RALPH D. GENAURIO, individual and
resident of Virginia,

Defendants - Appellants.

No. 04-1287

GARCIA FINANCIAL GROUP, INCORPORATED, a
District of Columbia corporation; JON J.
GARCIA, an individual and resident of the
District of Columbia,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

versus

VIRGINIA ACCELERATORS CORPORATION, a Virginia
corporation; RALPH D. GENAURIO, individual and
resident of Virginia,

Defendants - Appellants.

DULLES CAPITAL GROUP, INCORPORATED,

Party in Interest.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District
Judge. (CA-98-708-A)

Submitted: September 29, 2004 Decided: November 5, 2004

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John E. Harrison, HARRISON & HUGHES, P.C., Alexandria, Virginia,
for Appellants. Jonathan D. Westreich, Alexandria, Virginia, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Ralph D. Genaudio and Virginia Accelerators Corporation ("Appellants") appeal the district court's order granting Appellees' motion for Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 sanctions.* This Court reviews the imposition of Rule 11 sanctions for abuse of discretion. Chaudhry v. Gallerizzo, 174 F.3d 394, 410 (4th Cir. 1999). We have reviewed the briefs, joint appendices, and the district court's order, and find no abuse of discretion in the award of Rule 11 sanctions. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order granting Appellees' motion for sanctions. We deny, however, Appellees' motion for sanctions on appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

*We note that Appellants also noted an appeal of the district court's order of January 21, 2004, granting a writ of execution to Appellees. Because Appellants did not raise any issue pertaining to this order in their brief, or at any time after perfecting their appeal, we deem all claims pertaining to that order waived. See Carter v. Lee, 283 F.3d 240, 252 n. 11 (4th Cir. 2002) (contentions not raised in the opening brief generally considered waived).